

JUL 11 2006

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-18, which were all of the then pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. patent application publication no. 2004/0181753 (Michaelides). Claims 1-6 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, and Claims 7-12 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner, in the Office Action, also objected to an informality in the specification and objected to informalities in Claims 5, 11 and 13.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims, and Claims 7-12 are being amended to describe the subject matters of these claims as a "system" rather than a framework. In addition, the informalities that the Examiner noted in the specification and in Claims 5, 11 and 17 are being corrected. New Claim 19, which is dependent from Claim 1, is being added to describe preferred or optional features of the present invention.

More specifically, in paragraph 24 of the specification, the spelling of "field" is being corrected; and Claims 5, 11 and 17 are being amended, as the Examiner suggested, to be dependent from Claims 2, 8 and 14 respectively. In view of these changes, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objections to the informalities in the specification and Claims 5, 11 and 17.

Moreover, for the reasons discussed below, Claims 1-6 are clear and definite under 35 U.S.C. 112, Claims 7-12 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101, and all of Claims 1-19 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus

asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, the rejection of Claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. 101, and the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and the Examiner is asked to allow Claims 1-19.

The present invention, generally, relates to mapping data from a source to a destination, and more particularly, to a procedure and system for doing this in a way that makes it easy to work with different types of data sources.

As discussed in the instant application, businesses are making an increasing number of computer applications available worldwide for use by different types of users, such as customers, employees and suppliers. This worldwide access has many important advantages. It also presents important challenges. In particular, these applications need to be designed so that they can be used by different users who may access or input data to the applications using different data formats or files, and so that they can be readily modified to accommodate new or different data formats and files.

The present invention effectively addresses these challenges. Generally, this is done by providing a framework, or system, having a group of components, each of which can be readily modified or replaced independent of the other components, for handling various functions as data is mapped from the source to the destination. More specifically, the invention provides a plurality of separate components for performing defined functions to map the data from the source to the destination. A first of these components is used for reading the data from the source, and a second of the components is used for receiving the data from the first of the components and for processing the read data according to a set of rules. A third of the components is used for receiving the data from the second of the components and for loading the

data into the data destination. Each of the components operates independently of the other of the components, and each of the components can be modified, adjusted and replaced independent of the other of the components to facilitate mapping data from a plurality of different types of data sources into the data destination.

Applicants will specifically address each of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 101, 102 and 112.

In rejecting Claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. 101, the Examiner noted that the claims are directed to a "framework," which, the Examiner argued, does not fall into any of the four statutory categories. The Examiner also requested that applicants include in the claims limitations describing the practical application and the final result, which Applicant considers concrete, useful and tangible.

Claims 7-12 are being amended to change "framework" to "system." In view of this change, these claims are now directed to an apparatus, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101.

Also, independent Claim 7 is being amended to describe expressly the feature that each of the components, which are used in the mapping process, operates independently of the other of the components, and each of the components can be modified, adjusted and replaced independent of the other of the components to facilitate mapping data from a plurality of different types of data sources into the data destination.

Mapping data in this way is a concrete useful, and tangible result. It allows, for example, one application to be accessed by different users in different parts of the world even though those users might use different formats for dates, time and money, or for other reasons. With the present invention, those users do not have to work with a single, worldwide uniform format, but

instead can use what formats they are accustomed to using. The present invention can map data in different formats into a single, common database by simply changing or replacing the appropriate component of the mapping process used with a particular individual. And, with the present invention, this is made relatively easy because the components are independent - that is, one component can be changed or replaced without having any affect on the other components.

In light of the above-discussion, Claims 7-12 are directed to statutory subject matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101, and the Examiner is thus asked to reconsider and to withdraw this rejection of Claims 7-12.

In addition, Claims 1-6 fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

In rejecting these claims as indefinite, the Examiner noted that the claims describe a method for "mapping data from a data source to a data destination, but argued that this step is missing from the claim body, and the Examiner then argued that this makes Claims 1-6 indefinite.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1 is, as the Examiner noted, directed to a method for mapping data from a data source to a data destination. However, in this claim, the providing step, which is the first step in the body of the claim, expressly describes a plurality of components for performing defined functions to map the data from the source to the destination. In addition, the claim goes on to describe the steps and functions needed to achieve this mapping. In particular, Claim 1 expressly describes the features of reading the data from the source, processing the read data, and loading the data into the data destination. The result of these steps is that data is mapped from the source to the destination.

Applicants' Attorneys have carefully reviewed Claims 1-6, and these claims are clear and definite and fully satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112. The Examiner is, consequently, also asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 1-19 also patentably distinguish over the prior art because the prior art does not disclose or suggest the use of these three separate, independent components to map the data from the source to the destination, as described in independent Claims 1, 7 and 13.

More specifically, as mentioned above, in accordance with the present invention, a first component is used for reading the data from the source, and a second component is used for receiving the data from the first component and for processing the read data according to a set of rules. A third component is used for receiving the data from the second component and for loading the data into the data destination. Also, each of the components operates independently of the other of the components, and each of the components can be modified, adjusted and replaced independent of the other of the components to facilitate mapping data from a plurality of different types of data sources into the data destination.

The prior art does not disclose or suggest the use of such independent components in a process for mapping data from a source to a destination.

In particular, Michaelides, the only reference relied on by the Examiner to reject the claims, discloses a software tool for converting a source format to a target formal. In operation, a user provides a set of rules specifying how to transform source data from a source format to a target format. This is done by presenting the user with a series of templates that are filled in by the user. An engine is then used to access these rules to transform the data from the source. As shown in Figure 6 of Michaelides, this software tool can be considered as comprised of a series

of functional blocks, including a transformation engine, a formatting engine, a user interface, a feed database and a rule database. These functional blocks, however, do not operate in an independent manner, as the components of the present invention do. For instance, the functional blocks of Michaelides use rules from other functional blocks to process the data. Thus, a change in one functional block may have a direct affect on the specific way another functional block operate.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 describe the above-discussed aspect of the present invention. Specifically, each of these claims describes a plurality of separate components for performing defined functions to map the data from the source to the destination. A first of these components is used for reading the data from the source, and a second of the components is used for receiving the data from the first of the components and for processing the read data according to a set of rules. A third of the components is used for receiving the data from the second of the components and for loading the data into the data destination. Each of the components operates independently of the other of the components, and each of the components can be modified, adjusted and replaced independent of the other of the components to facilitate mapping data from a plurality of different types of data sources into the data destination.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also do not disclose or suggest this feature of the present invention.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 7 and 13 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these Claims 1, 7 and 13 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-6 and 19 are dependent

from, and are allowable with, Claim 1. Likewise, Claims 8-12 are dependent from Claim 7 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 14-18 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 13. The Examiner is, hence, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and to allow these claims and new Claim 19.

For the reasons discussed above, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objections to the informalities in the specification and in Claims 5, 11 and 17. The Examiner is also requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, the rejection of Claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. 101, and the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and to allow Claims 1-19. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 7472-4343

JSS:jy

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record.**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
 - LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.